

BX  
5132  
R281

REMARKS





THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES

---

R E M A R K S,

&c.

---

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

REMARKS  
UPON  
THE CONTROVERSY  
LATELY AGITATED BETWEEN  
THE REV<sup>D</sup> GEORGE WILKINS,  
VICAR OF ST. MARY'S,  
AND  
THE REV<sup>D</sup> JOHN BURNETT STUART,  
MINISTER OF ST JAMES'S CHURCH,  
**Nottingham.**

---

— “FIAT JUSTITIA.” —

---

LONDON;  
PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD AND SON,  
No. 157, PICCADILLY.

---

1823.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTEN LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

1009 5TH AVENUE NEW YORK CITY

1897

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTEN LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

1009 5TH AVENUE NEW YORK CITY

---

---

REMARKS,

BX

5132

R281

&c.

---

IT cannot but be a subject of deep regret, that, in a town where religious and political feeling runs so high as it does in this place, any difference of opinion should divide and alienate from each other the members of the established Church, more especially the Clergy. But if such difference of opinion does at any time take place, and it be thought necessary or expedient to settle the point in debate on the field of controversy, it were much to be wished that the combatants would remember, that many observant eyes are upon them, and that every deviation from Christian forbearance, or manly temper, will be keenly watched and severely censured. It should further be considered, that, whatever disgrace may fall personally upon themselves, a portion of it will be reflected, in some

measure, against the Church itself; and that, amid the din of hostile brethren, the insulting shout of the foe will arise, *Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof*\*.

In the instance now before us, it is to be feared, that these, and sundry other considerations of no inferior moment, have been lamentably forgotten. We have therefore thought, that it might not be altogether a useless performance to attempt a few brief and impartial Remarks, with the view of vindicating the Church, her doctrines, and a large portion of her Clergy, from misrepresentation; of exposing the errors, and discountenancing the spirit and temper, by which the controversy in question has been distinguished.

It appears that some misunderstanding has existed between the two Reverend Gentlemen, whose names are recorded in the title page, on the subject of the National Schools; and that Mr. Wilkins has felt himself aggrieved by certain regulations, adopted by the Committee, under the direction of Mr. Stuart, the Secretary. The alleged ground of complaint is, that the former of these Gentlemen found himself shut out from possessing that weight and influence in the management of the Institution, with which his official situation, as Vicar of St. Mary's, seemed to invest him; and particularly that his wishes were not

\* Psal. cxxxvii. 7.



complied with, when he desired, that the boys should be directed to attend at his own Chapel of Ease, lately erected, and where provision has been made for their accommodation. He, in consequence, withdrew his name from the list of subscribers; and determined to give publicity to his reasons for so doing. We do not consider either the one or the other of these acts commendable on the score of wisdom or candour; but, at the same time, we must in justice remark, that it appears fair and reasonable that every Clergyman should have the superintendence and control of his own parochial Sunday School.

Indeed, we regard such superintendence in the light of a solemn duty, and the almost total abandonment, especially in large towns, of the primitive mode of catechising the young, as one of the bad signs of the times. Sermons and tracts upon infidelity are of little avail in comparison with the utility of such an employment. Evening lectures and public addresses seem to be considered as appointments of most necessary observance; while the less splendid duty of instructing children is passed over, as a matter to be left to Sunday School teachers, and not coming within the range of the Clergyman's avocations. But children have consciences capable of being wrought upon, and judgments capable of being informed by divine truth, as well as their parents: and we repeat, that the machinery, by which such results are to

be produced, ought not to be left to the management of a Sunday School teacher, however exemplary or competent. The Clergyman ought not to be merely the presiding genius, but to be himself diligently employed in this labour of love, during some portion, at least, of every succeeding Sabbath.

Whether this be the end, for which the author of the "Letter" wished to establish his right to the management and control of the National School belonging to his parish, we are not informed: but we should suspect his views did not extend quite so far. Be this as it may, he is met by a "Reply" from Mr. Stuart, the spirit and language of which, to say the least, do neither himself, nor the cause of religion, much credit; and although the distinctive and well-known epithet of *Evangelical* is fixed upon him by his opponent, we should be led to think that the members of that body would exclaim, in reference to his reply,

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis  
Tempus eget.——

But the subject of the National Schools is not the only ground of misunderstanding between these Reverend Gentlemen. There are other, and far more important, shades of difference relative to Religion itself; and although this part of Mr.

Wilkins' letter does not constitute the ostensible and alleged ground of attack, yet it would appear, that it forms no unimportant portion of his plan. He claims for himself the appellation of true and legitimate Churchman; while he regards his adversary, and in fact the whole body of the evangelical Clergy, whose pretensions he despises, and whose doctrines he misrepresents, as possessing only a spurious claim to that honourable title. He affirms, that St. James' Church, or, as he is pleased to denominate it, St. James' Chapel, of which Mr. Stuart is the minister, is distinguished by a departure, both in *doctrine* and in *discipline*, from the establishment. What the *doctrines* are, which are usually delivered at that Church, the author of the "Reply" is fully competent to explain. And as he has been so diffuse upon the minor subject, in which, by the bye, himself, and not the public, is concerned, we much wish that he had been a little more explicit on this head also. The public would thus have been put in possession of his real sentiments, which, however, he carefully declines giving. This unnecessary caution is the more to be regretted in the present instance, on account of the displeasure, which he manifests at the charge of *moderate Calvinism* advanced by his opponent; who informs us, that that term defines the substance of the ministrations at St. James'. *Therefore*, he concludes, in those ministrations there is a manifest departure from the national

orthodoxy. But, probably, many of our readers will be of opinion, that this conclusion is a begging of the question ; and that it is a point, by no means proved, nor even attempted to be proved, by the author of the “ Letter,” that *moderate Calvinism* is at variance with the acknowledged formularies of the Church of England.

Of moderate Calvinism we ourselves predicate nothing. Before we bring our Remarks to a conclusion, we purpose to invite the attention of our readers, not indeed to the subject of moderate Calvinism, but to one of far greater importance, with which we are intimately concerned—the doctrines “ of our great Reformers.” Meanwhile, we shall content ourselves with barely affirming, that no proof whatever has been advanced by the author to shew, that moderate Calvinism does not coincide with the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, not one word from any of which has been adduced in either the first or “ Second Letter:” and yet these are the formularies of the national Church, which exhibit the national orthodoxy. Equally destitute of proof is the assertion, that “ the adherents to an evangelical ministry are neither more nor less than seceders\*.”

We are disposed to make large allowances for discrepancies and defects in writing arising from precipitancy, or warmth of feeling. We will go

\* Second Letter, p. 34.

further, and freely own, that we are far from looking for mathematical precision in a discourse, however argumentative on a subject, which involves ideas so complex, definitions so obscure, and terms so uncertain, as are, and ever must be involved in discussions of this nature. But this we will maintain, that, when a writer advances his positions in syllogistical form and order, we have a right to expect, that every step in the argument should be clearly proved, and its dependence upon other steps satisfactorily established, before we are hurried away to the conclusion. Otherwise we shall unavoidably be reminded of the question—

Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu ?

This is a duty incumbent upon a writer of such professions. How far he may have succeeded in his work, the reader is the only competent judge. If the proof be satisfactory, he will, of his own accord, pronounce the *quod est demonstrandum*. At any rate, declamation should have no place in our reasoning;—that ought to be, mind without passion.

Now, in all qualifications regarded as characteristic of an accurate and dispassionate reasoner, we apprehend Mr. Wilkins will be found lamentably deficient. He must be aware, that, however well satisfied he himself may be with his own arguments, the thinking part of mankind (and

after all it is the thinking part, whose decision will ultimately carry weight,) will decline giving a verdict in his favour upon *ex parte*, unfair, and imperfect evidence.

With regard to the other branch of the objection, relating to the *discipline* observed in St. James' Church, a satisfactory answer is given, and sufficient proof afforded of its agreement with that of the national Church, in the fact of its being under episcopal superintendence\*. In short, we never heard of any variation from established usage; nor do we believe any such has ever taken place there. We were much surprised to find Mr. Wilkins condescending, upon such a subject, to quote the authority of an obscure person, branded by the author of the "Reply" as "an avowed infidel;"

\* To which add, first, that the mode in which the Clergyman is remunerated cannot affect the discipline of the Church; by which term we mean the manner of performing the services, and administering the prescribed ceremonies, rites, and sacraments: and, secondly, that the Clergyman's salary being fixed by an Act of Parliament, the regulation so fixing it becomes a part of the law of the land. Notwithstanding, therefore, the redoubled earnestness, with which this point is urged upon our attention in the "Second Letter," and urged too with all the imposing effect of logical array, we cannot comprehend what the salary of the Clergyman has to do with the discipline of the Church; nor can we imagine, that either the wisdom of Parliament, or episcopal vigilance, would ever tolerate, much less sanction, any irregularity in discipline whatever.

although we are happy to learn he “ did not die  
“ an infidel\*.”

Mr. Wilkins' Letters thus exhibit many instances of egregious mistake, bold assumption, and false reasoning, on the subject of religion, accompanied with some sharp accusations, connected with the circumstances originating the controversy. At the same time it is but just to add, that these mistakes, assumptions, reasonings, and reflections, are conveyed in terms, although not palatable, yet certainly not grossly personal, nor clothed in the language of fierce and offensive invective.

A description the reverse of this characterises the “ Reply;” in which there is an apparent determination, on the part of the author, to put down his antagonist by the most unfair, and, by all sober controversialists, discarded methods of either attack or defence. We will only advert, without remarking upon them, to the following specimens :—“ *I am an*  
“ *orthodox Churchman :*”—“ *I am a true orthodox*  
“ *Churchman :*”—“ *I wish the public to judge of*  
“ *you and me by our fruits :*”—“ *You are heterodox*  
“ *in a greater or less degree, because you differ*  
“ *from me :*”—“ *That thick dark mist in which*  
“ *your mind has been enveloped by your passions :*”  
“ *Your insinuation is base. Your ignorance is*  
“ *pitiable. Your effrontery is the offspring of*  
“ *pride and ignorance.*”

In thus abandoning the calm and manly mode of sedate argumentation, and in adopting the supercilious and vituperative tone of an incensed polemic, the author of the "Reply" has unwisely surrendered the vantage ground, upon which he might successfully have planted his foot, and reasoned his erring brother out of his "heterodoxy," prejudices, and mistakes. The Vicar of St. Mary's had unreservedly stated his views, unhappily erroneous, upon the subject of religion; and an opportunity was thus afforded the Minister of St. James' of temperately discussing the points of difference between them, and of shewing him *a more excellent way*\*. He might have served his Master by a display of the truth as it is in Jesus, and by embodying a portion of his Spirit in his statement, which might have carried conviction to the thoughtful, have disarmed hostility of its weapons, and assuaged the fury of the rising storm. But the opportunity has been lost:—"There will  
 " come a time" says the judicious Hooker, "when  
 " three words uttered with charity and meekness,  
 " shall receive a far more blessed reward, than  
 " three thousand volumes, written with disdainful  
 " sharpness of wit."

As every Christian has to suffer some sort of discipline or other, so, in the present instance, the author of the "Reply" might have regarded the

\* 1 Cor. xii. 31.



circumstances of this attack upon him as his portion of what must fall sooner or later to the lot of all of us. He might thus have exhibited to the world an example of a Christian pastor under discipline displaying all the forbearance, meekness and gentleness of Christ; and held forth to the beholders a most impressive and instructive lesson of the manner how a Christian soldier can receive, and with what sober and prepared temperance of spirit and of language he can repel, the hostile shock of the adversary.

It was a remark made by the late excellent Dr. Buchanan\*, that “ we need to be ‘with-  
 “ ‘ stood to the face,’ like St. Peter, and to  
 “ receive the bastinado on the soles of our feet  
 “ once a month at least, to keep us active and  
 “ operative, ‘ according to the gift that is in us.’ ”  
 In the town of Nottingham, there is presented to our view a most awful sphere for unremitting exertion and unwearied activity. Let any one take his stand upon one of the neighbouring eminences, and look down upon the busy scene below him, contemplating with the eye of a Christian philanthropist the abodes of poverty, ignorance, vice and wretchedness, that cluster in the narrow streets: and let him ask whether among forty thousand immortal beings there is not ample space for ministerial exertion. Let the Clergy exercise their inventive faculties in devising, and their

\* Pearson's Life, vol ii. p. 228.

physical powers, as well as their weight and influence, in carrying into execution, benevolent plans for ameliorating the condition of their poor fellow-creatures. One scheme, the best perhaps ever devised, has been already brought into full activity in the town, through the efforts of Mr. Dudley. Is this fully and heartily entered into? Is the Church Missionary Society supported as it ought to be? Why are there no Annual Meetings? Why are the sums collected on such occasions to be lost to the Society? Why are not greater pains taken to add to the number of subscribers? We ask these questions, not because we would have them spend their zeal on such matters, and reserve none for other occasions, but because the state of the pulse on these important points is a pretty sure indication of the disposition of the mind towards others. Above all, we ask them from a feeling of compassion for the multitudes of our fellow-men, who are hourly falling victims to a disease, for which no remedy exists but the Gospel of Jesus Christ. With Mr. Wilkins' present views it were too much, perhaps, to expect his support. He has energy and talents, however, which, if they were under divine influence, and properly directed, would render him a most efficient instrument in the hands of God for good to his Church; and we would say concerning him,

——— *Utinam noster esset!*

We are sure nothing would render him more popular or useful in the town and county, than his coming forward to support with boldness and decision those institutions, which are the glory of his country, and the sources of multiplied blessings to the world. As it regards others of the Clergy, we fear that the charge of inactivity and inconsistency lies at their door; and that it will be no easy task to disprove or repel it. Better will it be both for them and for others, if, instead of entering on so fruitless an attempt, they set about a revision of their conduct. *Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die\**.

The author of the "Reply" informs Mr. Wilkins that he will address him in more measured language, when he "shall have acquired a clear knowledge of facts, of characters, and of doctrines†." But how is he to acquire this necessary knowledge? If a person be unfortunate enough to be ignorant, it is rather hard upon him, that we should, on that account, visit him with our displeasure. Shall we be angry, because he is ignorant? Besides, ignorance in matters of doctrine is a serious and alarming evil. Ignorance of facts may disqualify us from delivering a correct judgment on any question in debate: ignorance of characters may render us liable to imposture on the part of the designing and the selfish—incon-

\* Rev. iii. 2.

† Page 10.

veniences that have their termination, however, in the present world: but ignorance of the doctrines of the Gospel may be attended with fatal consequences—consequences fatal to the soul—to its peace and final blessedness. *This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Ckrist. God is light\**: we are no *partakers of the divine nature*†, if we partake not of the divine light; and without this light we must lie down in eternal darkness. Ignorance here, then, so far from being a reason why we should treat our brother with scorn, gives him a just claim on our compassion, and an equal one on our best endeavours to bring him into the right way.

It appears, that the author of the “Reply” is very desirous to disavow “the peculiar opinions of Calvin.” Yet he himself entertains some “private peculiar opinions about points not necessary to salvation.” These, however, in deference to “Bishops and Archbishops,” he refrains from avowing. In the same breath he challenges the Vicar of St. Mary’s, “and every man living upon the earth, to specify any religious doctrine he believes, which he does not avow with the most fearless honesty.” Without attempting to reconcile these apparently contradictory statements, the question for consideration is, what is meant by

\* 1 John i. 5.

† 2 Pet. i. 4.

opinions. We confess we felt somewhat surprised, that the author should designate any doctrine, or truth, in religion by the term *opinion*; especially as he had just before, in the preceding paragraph, spoken of “religious *principles*” in the same sense and meaning. It is evident, however, that he uses the word *opinion* as synonymous with *principle* or *doctrine*. Now it is to be remembered, that the term *opinion* is the common cant word of the Infidel, the Deist, and the Unitarian, who are in the habit of frittering away the doctrines of Revelation, which it suits any of the parties to modify or reject. They will all of them alike exclaim with ineffable *sang froid*—“Oh! that is “all a matter of *opinion*.” But although we regard the introduction of the term as injudicious, we will not do the author the injustice to suppose for a moment that he intended any such thing. Since, then, he takes shelter under the broad shield of episcopal authority, to justify the non-avowal on his part of certain “religious doctrines,” or “religious “principles,” or, if he likes it better, “religious “opinions,” we would take the liberty of asking him, what are those parts of Scripture, upon which these opinions are founded? Are they kept back? Is there any reservation here? His opinions he has a right to do with as he pleases: but he has no right to exercise such discretion with regard to God’s revealed will; nor to mutilate nor withhold any portion of it from the people. We do not

accuse him of so doing; we only mean to say, that it is done; and that those, who are guilty of such unhallowed presumption, adopt the very same language that the author uses. Let him beware, that he does not render himself obnoxious to the imputation. Let him take heed, while he bestows such terms of unqualified praise upon his congregation, that he does not lull many of them asleep in their sins. Let him not allow the worldly, the covetous, and the nominal christian, to appropriate his commendations to themselves. Let him not, in deference to their fastidious and unsanctified ears, shun to declare the whole counsel of God. Let him remember, that what Almighty God has deemed fit to be written and read of all, no power on earth can prohibit as unfit to be preached\*. We trust no apology will be necessary for recommending to his attention the following observations immediately bearing on this part of our subject, which were penned by one of the most learned, and most excellent of men some two or three hundred years ago. “ *Quænam igitur tenenda*

\* “ If the present age is not capable of receiving the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ, yet it is something to preach it in part, and as far as we can. There is a certain pious craft, (*rafritics*,) and an innocent time-serving, which we must use.” This was the advice Erasmus gave to the Lutherans. Happy for the world and the Church, even in Jortin’s estimation, that it was not followed. — *Jortin’s Life of Erasmus*, p. 260.

“ *est Pastoribus docendi ratio? Primum non suo*  
 “ *arbitrio æstiment quid proferre in medium et*  
 “ *quid omittere utile sit: sed uni Deo arbitrium*  
 “ *ejus rei deferant. Ita humanis commentis non*  
 “ *patebit in Ecclesiam Dei ingressus. Deinde*  
 “ *non sumet sibi mortalis homo lacerandæ vel*  
 “ *mutilandæ Scripturæ audaciam, ut hoc vel illud*  
 “ *quoad visum fuerit delibet, quædam obscuret,*  
 “ *multa supprimat: sed quicquid in Scripturis*  
 “ *patefactum est, licet prudenter et tempestive*  
 “ *pro ædificatione populi, simpliciter tamen et*  
 “ *sine fuco tradet, ut decet fidum et ingenuum*  
 “ *Dei interpretem. Prudentiam adhibendam esse*  
 “ *dixi: quia spectanda est semper utilitas, modo*  
 “ *absit vafrities, in qua multi nimis sibi placent,*  
 “ *dum ad suas methodos inflectunt Dei verbum.”*

Before we advert to the sentiments developed in Mr. Wilkins' two Letters on the 'subject of evangelical doctrine, we think it necessary to premise, that we by no means feel ourselves called upon to follow the writer through all the irrelevant matter he has occasionally introduced into both of them; nor to reply to the vulgar and common-place abuse so plentifully bestowed upon John Calvin and his supposed followers, against whom he has opened his battery in such a determined spirit of hostility. But we can assure him, that we are not among the number of those, whom he represents as being absolutely transported with the “apology for the Calvi-

“ nistic Clergy just furnished by the Edinburgh “ Review : ” for we have never seen the article ; nor are we in the habit of looking into that journal for information on any subject, much less that of Calvinism. We admire neither its religion, nor its politics. We doubt not, however, that to all it has been a matter of astonishment, and to many a subject of ridicule, to observe, with what easy flippancy of style and manner, the writer of the Letters under review has obtruded into them remarks so much at variance with his original design. It is in this way that Dr. Marsh’s name is announced. With regard to that Prelate, the castigation he received in the House of Lords, together with the total failure of support from the members of Government and the Episcopal Bench, is a pretty clear proof of his “ defeat,” as it certainly would be thought, by one alive to feelings of mortification and wounded pride, indicative also of his “ disgrace.” It is to be hoped, that the inconveniences he has already suffered from his temerity, will read him a useful lesson. But if it should turn out differently, and he should be too proud to learn by experience, that sound and faithful teacher, we are persuaded that the public voice will ultimately compel him to stoop. It is possible, indeed, that he will even then, as he once did in the pulpit of Alma Mater, apply to himself the bold declaration of an undaunted mind—*impavidum ferient ruinæ* : be that as it may,



we dismiss the subject, and pass on to the consideration of Mr. Wilkins' sentiments touching the doctrines "of our great Reformers," and those of the evangelical Clergy of the present day; who, it seems, according to him, have departed most widely from the rational divinity of their forefathers; maintaining a "severity of doctrine\*," not at all sanctioned by the Articles, and adopting a "severity of discipline†" by no means required; who, in a word, resort to the most "violent measures," and run into the most "unnatural extremes."

If Mr. Wilkins does not know it, we will tell him, that the period is gone by when all this unmeaning declamation about "religious austerity," and "unrelaxing gravity," and similar terms of reproach by him unjustly heaped upon those, who will live godly in Christ Jesus, would have been more cordially entertained than at present. It is now no longer so generally a received maxim as it was at one time of day, that religion is the parent of melancholy. On the contrary, it is thought desirable, even among the most sober and considerate part of mankind, to make use of its soothing influence to tranquillize the mental disquietude of those of our fellow-creatures, who are visited with the very heaviest calamity that can afflict our fallen nature. But as he has been so

\* Letter, p. 7.

† Ibid. p. 11.

unfortunate as to stumble upon such a stale topic for animadversion, we will remind him of a repartee of the late excellent Bishop Horne. When Mr. Hume once said to him, he never saw a religious man who was not melancholy, the Bishop replied, with pleasantry, "that it was enough to make a good man melancholy to see him." We would not be unnecessarily severe; but we cannot refrain from declaring, if the tenor of Mr. Wilkins' exhortations from the pulpit coincides with these his productions from the press; if the listening throng are sent away to conflict with the toils and anxieties and temptations and troubles of life with no firmer panoply, and no richer consolation, than what we read of in these pages; if he has nothing better than this to talk of when he approaches the death-bed of a poor heavy-laden sinner, weighed down with the burden of his great and many sins, we are sure, that no Christian mind can contemplate his ministerial exertions without emotions that would call up looks of sadness and melancholy\*.

But not to rest in general remarks, let us come to particulars. We propose, therefore, to lay open

\* "It too often happens, that we lose sight of that which is our duty to publish—the word of reconciliation—to propound the terms of peace and pardon to the penitent; and we make no other use of the high commission that we bear, than to come abroad one day in the seven, dressed in solemn looks, and in the external garb of holiness, to be the APES OF EPICTETUS." — *Horsley's Charges*, p. 7.

both what Mr. Wilkins denies, and what he affirms, upon the subjects above mentioned; and to produce such documents as may be necessary to illustrate the doctrines of our Church and the sentiments of our Reformers. The reader will then be capable of determining for himself concerning the “ancient orthodoxy,” which Mr. Wilkins so much, and so deservedly commends; and whether his acceptation of the term be, or be not, the same as that which was held at the period of the Reformation. The following synopsis will exhibit the writer’s opinions. The doctrine of the fall, and of the corruption of our nature, he considers as by no means involving those dreadful consequences, which are so constantly attributed to it in the writings and sermons of the Evangelical Clergy. They represent the fall\*, he says, and the corruption of our nature, “as *infinitely* greater than the Church “has considered them.” Original corruption passes away at our baptism; so that all, who are brought by the disposing power and will of man, to the font, are delivered from original sin†. The righteousness of Christ wholly imputed to man, cannot, alone, purchase his salvation. He is not saved by an act of special grace through faith alone. The

\* Second Letter, p. 12.

† “These of the Church of Rome believe, that original sin is quite taken away by baptism.”—*Burnet’s Exp. of Arts.* p. 112.

works of man are so far useful, that he can ground upon them direct hopes of salvation. His practical holiness avails in order to justification. The gate of heaven “ can only be gained by the performance “ of many hard and painful instances of duty\*.” The Evangelical Clergy do not move the sick and dying to repent of their sins. Yet, strange as it may appear, and, as if it were to make up for their negligence towards men while *living*, they disturb them when *dead*; and actually “ bewilder “ the dead in the mazes of unedifying cant and “ jargon†.” When compared with these weak and wicked opinions and practices, how simple and beautiful is the following theory! By an elegant prosopopœia Religion, assisted by Nature‡, is exhibited as the conductress of mankind to heaven. The road thither winds up a steep mountain, on the summit of which, Perfection, by another application of the same rhetorical figure, is represented as a goddess sitting enthroned. The ascent is not by a path, sudden, straight, and inaccessible; but gradual, easy, and circuitous. The travellers are divided into eight classes, and are thus distinguished:—the negligent, the idle, the tardy, the timid, the weak, the weary, the gloomy, and the rash. Of these four are marked by very culpable failings; the other four by infirmities over

\* Letter, p. 12.

† Second Letter, p. 14.

‡ Letter, p. 11.

which they have no control: none, as far as we are told, have their eyes fixed on the Son of God, and yet all of them are to be animated by a prospect of the resplendent height above them, and by the glory which is to reward and crown their labours. Mortification and austerity are forbidden, lest they should generate a morose and unsocial temper; although we observe, even among Mr. Wilkins' religious devotees, a class denominated the "*gloomy*."

The statement just given, contains what the writer designates "*original, apostolical Evangelism*"—"the Evangelism of our great Reformers;" and intimates, that it altogether agrees "with the venerable and sober sentiments of the Establishment." "*Modern Evangelism*," he maintains, differs from *original* Evangelism, "by an intermixture of doctrines, with which it has no proper affinity:" while, on the other hand, "our most eminent divines" preserved the latter free from all such impure admixtures.

The view here taken by the writer of the doctrines of our Church, he confirms and illustrates by quotations from Secker and Tillotson. Hence he thinks he has triumphantly proved his point, that these are the sentiments of our Reformers. But is Mr. Wilkins so little versed in the ecclesiastical history of his own country as to rank Secker and Tillotson among the Reformers? Or does he think, that because Tillotson, as he

rather ludicrously expresses it, “ has laid it down,” that therefore Tillotson’s positions exhibit the doctrines of the Reformation? Mr. Wilkins must not thus leave the field of controversy. As he has made his appeal to our “ great Reformers,” to our great Reformers he shall go; and while we are in our way to their tribunal, we will treat him with an extract from his own favourite Secker. The passage is taken from one of his charges to the Clergy\* :—“ To improve the people effectually,... “ you must be assiduous in teaching the principles “ not only of virtue and natural religion, but of “ THE GOSPEL; and of the Gospel, not as “ ALMOST EXPLAINED AWAY by modern “ refiners, but ‘ as the truth is in Jesus;’ as it is “ taught by the Church of which you are members; “ as you have engaged by your subscriptions and “ declarations, that you will teach it yourselves.— “ You must preach to them faith in the ever-blessed “ Trinity;...you must set forth the original corruption of our nature; our redemption according to “ God’s eternal purpose in Christ, by the sacrifice “ of the cross; our sanctification by the influences “ of the Divine Spirit; the insufficiency of good “ works, and the efficacy of faith to salvation.”

The important inquiry, then, on which we are now about to enter, is this: what are the doctrines of the Church of England, and the sentiments of the

\* Watson’s Tracts, vol. vi. ch. 1.

Reformers concerning the fall of man—original sin—justification by faith—the efficacy of Christ's righteousness and atonement—the nature and efficacy of faith—the nature and importance of good works—and the privileges attached to baptism. These points open a wide field; but we will endeavour to be as brief as possible while we illustrate them singly or together, as it may best suit our convenience.

In pursuing this inquiry, we shall of course extract largely from the acknowledged formularies of the Church, her Articles, and Homilies. We shall also avail ourselves of the writings of the Reformers themselves, where, if language can express thought, their sentiments are fully laid open: We shall further quote from their public declarations sanctioned by authority, and shall throw in such incidental proofs and illustrations as may occur to us from the early Fathers and others, who lived in the successive periods of the Church down to the Reformation. The confessions of the continental Reformed Churches will also claim our regard.

Among the works here referred to, three deserve particular attention:—the Catechism published by royal authority, anno 1553, 7th Edward VI., on the recommendation of Cranmer, which has obtained the name of King Edward's Catechism:—the Catechism drawn up at the instigation of Cecil by the learned Dr. Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's,

also published by authority:—and, lastly, Jewell’s Apology. These three most important documents were republished some years since, by Dr. Randolph then Bishop of Oxford, in his *Enchiridion* — a collection of tracts for the use of students in divinity. The learned Prelate observes in the preface, that King Edward’s Catechism “ was the  
 “ last work of the Reformers of that reign; whence  
 “ it may be fairly understood to contain, as far as  
 “ it goes, their ultimate decision, and to represent  
 “ the sense of the Church of England as then  
 “ established. Jewell’s Apology is an account of  
 “ the grounds of our separation from the Church  
 “ of Rome, as maintained after that separation  
 “ had finally taken place: Nowell’s Catechism of  
 “ the doctrines of the Church at the same period,  
 “ when it had been restored and established under  
 “ Queen Elizabeth.”

*The fall of Adam, and the doctrine of original sin*, will first require our notice. Nothing can be more express than the language of the ninth Article, on this part of our subject. “ Original  
 “ sin...is the fault and corruption of the nature  
 “ of every man, that naturally is engendered of  
 “ the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far  
 “ (*quam longissime*) gone from original righteousness,  
 “ and is of his own nature inclined to evil,  
 “ so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the  
 “ spirit; and therefore, in every person born into  
 “ this world, it deserveth God’s wrath and dam-



“ nation.”—Concerning the interpretation of this, and all other of the thirty-nine Articles, let us, before we proceed, once for all lay down the rule.

“ No man hereafter, shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article\* aside any way, but shall submit to it in the *plain and full meaning* thereof: and shall not put his *own sense or comment* to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the *literal and grammatical sense*†.”

And again—“ We will not endure any varying or departing from them in the *least degree*‡.”

Let us now refer to our Homilies, in the composition of which Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Jewell had so large a share. “ Neither he (Adam) nor any of his, had any right or interest at all in the kingdom of heaven; but were become plain reprobates and castaways, being perpetually damned to the everlasting pains of hell fire§.” Again, “ Of ourselves, and by ourselves, we are not able either to think a good thought, or work a good deed; so that we can find in ourselves no

\* “ The Article,” *i. e.* the Seventeenth. Therefore *a fortiori* all the rest.

† His Majesty’s Declaration prefixed to the Articles.

‡ This Declaration, while it furnishes a specimen of the manner how the King exercises his authority as head of the Church of England, affords a short, but conclusive reply to all the crude objections of its enemies upon that point.

§ Homily on the Passion.

“ hope of salvation, but rather whatsoever maketh  
 “ unto our destruction\*.” Again; “ Man of his  
 “ own nature is fleshly and carnal, corrupt and  
 “ nought, sinful and disobedient to God, *with-*  
 “ *out any spark of goodness in him, without*  
 “ *any virtuous or godly notion, only given to evil*  
 “ *thoughts and wicked deeds* †.” “ Into this  
 “ miserable captivity, we were cast, through the  
 “ envy of the devil, by breaking of God’s com-  
 “ mandment in our first parent Adam ‡.” “ Where-  
 “ by it came to pass, that as before he was blessed,  
 “ so now he was accursed; as before he was loved,  
 “ so now he was abhorred; as before he was most  
 “ beautiful and precious, so now he was most vile  
 “ and wretched in the sight of his Lord and  
 “ Maker: instead of the image of God, he was  
 “ now become the image of the devil; instead of  
 “ the citizen of heaven, he was become the bond-  
 “ slave of hell; having in himself no one part of  
 “ his former purity and cleanness, but being alto-  
 “ gether spotted and defiled; insomuch that now  
 “ he seemed to be *nothing else but a lump of sin,*  
 “ and therefore, by the *just judgment* of God, was  
 “ condemned to everlasting death.

“ This, so great and miserable a plague, if it  
 “ had only rested on Adam, who first offended, it

\* Homily on the Misery of Man.

† For Whitsunday.

‡ Homily on the Misery of Man.

“ had been so much the easier, and might the  
 “ better have been borne. But it fell not only on  
 “ him, but also on his posterity and children for  
 “ ever; so that the whole brood of Adam’s flesh  
 “ should sustain the self-same fall and punishment  
 “ which their forefather, by his offence, most justly  
 “ had deserved. St. Paul, in the fifth chapter of  
 “ the Romans, saith,—*By the offence of only*  
 “ *Adam, the fault came upon all men to condem-*  
 “ *nation, and by one man’s disobedience, many*  
 “ *were made sinners.* By which words we are  
 “ taught, that as in Adam all men universally  
 “ sinned, so in Adam all men universally received  
 “ the reward of sin; that is to say, became mortal,  
 “ and subject unto death, having in themselves  
 “ nothing but everlasting damnation both of body  
 “ and soul. *They became, as David saith, cor-*  
 “ *rupt and abominable; they went all out of the*  
 “ *way, there was none that did good; no, not*  
 “ *one.*

“ O what a miserable and woeful state was this,  
 “ that the sin of one man should *destroy and*  
 “ *condemn all men*,—that nothing in all the world  
 “ might be looked for, but *only pangs of death,*  
 “ *and pains of hell* \*!” Once more;—“ We have  
 “ heard how evil we be of ourselves; how of our-  
 “ selves, and by ourselves, we have no goodness,  
 “ help, nor salvation; but contrariwise, sin, dam-

\* On the Nativity.

“ nation, and death everlasting: *which, if we*  
 “ *deeply weigh and consider, we shall the better*  
 “ *understand the great mercy of God, and how*  
 “ *our salvation cometh only by Christ\*.*” Again;  
 “ If he should deal with us according to his jus-  
 “ tice, we do deserve a thousand hells, if there  
 “ could be so many†.”

We would here make our appeal to the reader: can any language be stronger than what is contained in the above extracts? Is it possible to convey, in any terms whatever, a representation of our state as sinners before God, more degrading? Can any thing be added to it to make redemption more glorious? And yet, says the Author of the Letters,—“ In the writings of the Evangelical Clergy, “ the fall of man, and the consequent corruption “ of our nature, are represented as *infinitely* greater “ than the Church has considered them, in order “ to make redemption appear a more astonishing “ act of love and mercy.” If so, let him bring forward his proofs.

We have seen what the doctrine of the Church is upon this subject; let us now examine some other documents, which will throw additional light on the sentiments of the Reformers. The next extract shall be taken from King Edward's Catechism:—“ Forthwith the image of God was defaced “ in them: and the most beautiful proportion of

\* On the Misery of Man.

† On Repentance.

“ righteousness, holiness, truth, and knowledge of  
 “ God, was confounded, and in a manner utterly  
 “ blotted out. There remained the earthly image,  
 “ joined with unrighteousness, guile, fleshly mind,  
 “ and deep ignorance of godly and heavenly things.  
 “ Hereof grew the weakness of the flesh: hereof  
 “ came this corruption, and disorder of lusts and  
 “ affections: hereof came that pestilence: hereof  
 “ came that seed and nourishment of sins where-  
 “ with mankind is infected, and it is called *sin*  
 “ *original*. Moreover thereby nature was so cor-  
 “ rupted and overthrown, that unless the goodness  
 “ and mercy of Almighty God had helped us by  
 “ the mediation of grace, even as in body we are  
 “ thrust down into all wretchedness of death; so  
 “ must it needs have been, that *all men of all*  
 “ *sorts should be thrown into everlasting punish-*  
 “ *ment, and fire unquenchable.*” A similar testi-  
 mony is borne in Dr. Nowell’s Catechism; but  
 we do not wish to multiply extracts unneces-  
 sarily. The same may be affirmed of Jewell’s  
 Apology.

Bishop Horsley\* recommends a “ perusal of the  
 “ Confession of Faith of the Church of Saxony,”  
 written in the year 1551, at the Synod of Witten-  
 berg, and subscribed by all the pastors and doctors  
 then present, as a repetition of the Augsburg Con-  
 fession, in order to be laid before the Council of

\* Charges, p. 37.

Trent\*. The Augsburg was drawn up by the mild Melancthon, the bosom friend of Luther, and is by many regarded as a palliative. But the learned reader will be struck with the following extract from the Saxon Confession, *de peccato originis*, as being equally strong and explicit with the testimony given above. “ Est itaque peccatum  
 “ originis, et propter lapsum primorum parentum,  
 “ et propter hanc depravationem quæ lapsum secuta  
 “ est, nascentes reos esse iræ Dei, et dignos æterna  
 “ damnatione, nisi fiat remissio propter mediato-  
 “ rem. Et hæc depravatio est, carere jam luce  
 “ Dei, quæ in nobis fulsisset: et est aversio volun-  
 “ tatis nostræ a Deo, et contumacia cordis repug-  
 “ nans legi mentis, ut Paulus loquitur: et homi-  
 “ nem non esse templum Dei, sed miseram massam,  
 “ sine Deo, et sine justitiâ†.”

We cannot be supposed to know what meaning Mr. Wilkins affixes to the term “ ancient,” when he speaks of the “ *ancient orthodoxy*.” But we will beg leave to lay before the reader a passage from the rich productions of that ornament of the twelfth century, Bernard; to shew how the “ *ancient*” writers, even in the darkest periods of the Church, thought and wrote upon this subject. Referring to the Enchiridion of Augustine, of whom we shall speak hereafter, he says, “ In hoc peccato

\* Sylloge Confessionum, Prefatio xvi. Oxoni 1804.

† Ibid. p. 210.

“ multa criminalia comprehenduntur peccata.  
 “ Quod enim Adam scienter se contra Deum  
 “ erexit, superbia magna fuit: quod autem plus-  
 “ quam sibi suffecit appetiit, avaritia fuit. Non  
 “ est enim avaritia tantum pecuniæ, sed et altitu-  
 “ dinis. Quia seipsum in mortem præcipitavit,  
 “ homicidium fuit: quia vero semetipsum amando,  
 “ ab amore sponsi cœlestis alienavit, adulterii  
 “ crimen incurrit: et quia cibum vetitum usur-  
 “ pavit, furtum fecit; et quia Deo non credidit,  
 “ sacrilegium fecit\*.”

The reader will not fail to observe, that in this quotation Bernard enlarges upon the *nature* and *aggravation* of Adam's transgression. We will now produce another, evincing his sentiments on *our participation in the sin*, and furnishing a striking comment on those words of the Psalmist,—  
 “ *In sin did my mother conceive me.*” “ Orig-  
 “ nale peccatum quidem maximum illud delictum  
 “ vocatur, quod a primo Adam contrahimus, in  
 “ quo peccavimus omnes, pro quo morimur uni-  
 “ versi. Maximum plane, quod sic totum non  
 “ modo genus humanum, sed et quemlibet ipsius  
 “ generis occupat, ut non sit qui evadat, non sit  
 “ usque ad unum. A primo homine ad novissi-  
 “ mum usque protenditur: et in singulis quoque a  
 “ planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis diffun-

\* Bernardi Opera, tom. ii. p. 555, Parisiis Ed. 1719.—  
 Comp. Lightfoot, vol. i. ch. lvi. p. 1027.

“ ditur hoc venenum. Sed et aliter nihilo minus  
 “ in universam dilatatur ætatem, ab ea scilicet  
 “ die, qua sua quemque concipit, usque ad eam,  
 “ qua communis eum recipit mater\*.” We are  
 constrained forcibly to arrest our inclinations;  
 otherwise they would lead us to transcribe the  
 whole of this section, replete as it is with piety,  
 truth, and eloquence.

From those eminent Reformers, Calvin and Luther, the most indubitable evidence may be also adduced. In Calvin’s Commentary on Genesis iii., the most comprehensive views are developed in language at once beautiful and affecting; and Luther’s *de servo arbitrio*, from beginning to end bears equally powerful testimony. From the writings of the English Reformers, besides those which we have already referred to, it would be no difficult task to collect voluminous attestations to the same purpose. But we will content ourselves with one from Tyndal†, who was called the Apostle of England, and will conclude this branch of our inquiry with two or three extracts from Fox, illustrative of the estimate formed of *themselves* by such men as Bradford, Cranmer, and Hooper.

\* Bernardi Opera, tom. i. p. 893.

† For an account of Tyndal, see Fox’s Book of Martyrs, and Fuller’s Church History; Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. i. p. 159; and a very useful work, lately published by Mr. Whittaker, exposing the absurdities of Mr. Bellamy’s New Version.



“ By nature,” says this celebrated Reformer,  
 “ through the fall of Adam, are we the children  
 “ of wrath, heirs of the vengeance of God by birth,  
 “ yea, and from our conception. And we have  
 “ our fellowship with the damned devils, under  
 “ the power of darkness, and rule of Satan, while  
 “ we are yet in our mothers’ wombs; and though  
 “ we shew not forth the fruits of sin as soon as we  
 “ be born, yet are we full of the natural poison,  
 “ whereof all sinful deeds spring, and cannot but  
 “ sin outwardly (be we never so young) as soon  
 “ as we be able to work, if occasion be given, for  
 “ our nature is to do sin, as is the nature of a ser-  
 “ pent to sting. And as a serpent yet young,  
 “ or yet unbrought forth, is full of poison, and  
 “ cannot afterward (when the time is come and  
 “ occasion given) but bring forth the fruits thereof;  
 “ —and as an adder, a toad, or a snake, is hated  
 “ of man (not for the evil it hath done, but for the  
 “ poison that is in it, and hurt which it cannot but  
 “ do), so are we hated of God for that natural  
 “ poison, which is conceived and born with us,  
 “ before we do any outward evil.....Because that  
 “ of nature we are evil, therefore we both think  
 “ and do evil, and are under vengeance under the  
 “ law, convict to eternal damnation by the law,  
 “ and are contrary to the will of God in all our  
 “ will, and in all things consent to the will of  
 “ the fiend\*.”

\* Fathers of the English Church, vol. i. p. 16.

In one of Mr. Bradford's Letters we meet with the following passage:—" I have justly deserved " a hundred thousand deaths at God's hands, by " reason of my sins\*." In another letter, dated Feb. 8, 1555, he thus writes to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, touching his expected martyrdom:—" I have been a great hypocrite, and a grievous " sinner.—O what am I, Lord, that thou shouldest " thus magnifie me, so vile a man and miser as al- " ways I have been? Is this thy wont, to send for " such a wretch and an hypocrite as I have been, in " a fiery chariot, as thou didst for Helias? Oh dear " Fathers, be thankful for me†." Archbishop Cranmer, in his prayer before the last exhortation to the people, which he addressed to them at his death, utters these words:—" O Father of Heaven, " O Son of God, Redeemer of the world, O Holy " Ghost, three persons and one God, have mercy " upon me, most wretched caitif and miserable " sinner. I have offended both against heaven " and earth, more than my tongue can express. " Whither then may I go, or whither shall I flee? " To heaven I may be ashamed to lift up mine " eyes, and in earth I find no place of refuge or " succour. To thee, therefore, O Lord, do I run; " to thee do I humble myself.....Wherefore have " mercy on me, O God, whose property is always " to have mercy‡, &c. &c." Bishop Hooper's

\* Fox's Martyrs, vol. iii. p. 286.

† Ibid. vol. iii. p. 266. (Ed. 1684.)

‡ Ibid. vol. iii. p. 561.

words are these :—" Lord, I am hell, but thou art  
 " heaven; I am a sink of sin, but thou art a  
 " gracious God, and a merciful Redeemer. Have  
 " mercy therefore upon me, most miserable and  
 " wretched offender\*."

The reader will now be prepared to enter on another branch of this inquiry, the consideration of the other points mentioned above. It will have occurred to him, that as the Vicar of St. Mary's attributes so little importance to the doctrine of the fall and original sin, it were natural to expect from him a similar treatment of that great article of our creed, denominated by an eminent Reformer *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*—we mean, *justification by faith only*. The truth is, we shrewdly suspect, that Mr. Wilkins possesses no very sensible perception of the vicarious sufferings, everlasting dignity, and almighty power of the Son of God. And yet this is the doctrine, which stands in the very front of the Gospel scheme. It is the foundation corner-stone which supports the fabric, and it is the upper corner-stone which, as it were, binds and adorns it. What are all the sacrifices of the Jewish law, but lively representations of the Saviour bearing away the sins of men? What are all the declarations of the New Testament but a full and clear revelation of the same truth—that *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them*†,

\* Fox, vol. iii. p. 127.

† 2 Cor. v. 19.

that he is now *just*, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus\*? We will proceed therefore to examine the doctrine of the Church upon this subject, and the view taken of it by our Reformers. “The Reformers,” observes Bishop Burnet, “began at the laying down this as the foundation of all Christianity, and of all our hopes,—that we were reconciled to God merely through his mercy, by the redemption purchased by Jesus Christ: and that a firm believing the Gospel, and a cleaving to the death of Christ, as the great propitiation for our sins, according to the terms on which it is offered to us in the Gospel, was that which united us to Christ; that gave us an interest in his death, and thereby justified us†.” Accordingly we find this doctrine set forth most clearly and perspicuously in the eleventh Article. “We are *accounted righteous* before God, *ONLY for the merit* of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified *by faith ONLY*, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily of justification.” Unfathomable mystery! *righteous* before God—him who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity: “*accounted righteous only for*,” “*tantum propter*,” only on account of the merit of “our Lord

\* Rom. iii. 26.

† Exp. p. 125.

“ and Saviour Jesus Christ.” Observe the striking contrast, which is here either expressed or implied: merit opposed to guilt; the being reputed (reputamur) righteous to condemnation; our faith set against our works; the person of the surety, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, against the person of the sinner; fulness of comfort, the fruit of faith, against anguish of heart, the fruit of sin—all of which are as remote the one from the other, as light is from darkness.

Let the following questions be put, and let them be answered by the Reformers, and by the Church of God in all ages. *What is the ground of a sinner's justification before God? What is the means of his justification? Who are the justified? How are they distinguished?*

To begin with the first of these questions. An answer is readily obtained. “ Christ is now the  
 “ righteousness of all them that truly do believe  
 “ in him. He for them paid their ransom by his  
 “ death. He for them fulfilled the law in his life;  
 “ so that now, in him, and by him, every true  
 “ Christian man may be called a *fulfiller of the*  
 “ *law*\*.” “ God doth no more *impute* unto us  
 “ our former *sins*, but he doth *impute* and give  
 “ unto us the *justice* and *righteousness* of his Son  
 “ Jesus Christ†,” who “ changeth with us, taketh

\* Hom. of Salvation.

† Cranmer, Fathers Eng. ch. iii. p. 227.

“ our sins and wickedness from us, and giveth  
 “ unto us his holiness, righteousness, justice, ful-  
 “ filling of the law; *and so consequently everlast-*  
 “ *ing life: so that we be like as if we had done*  
 “ *no sin at all*; for his righteousness standeth us  
 “ in so good stead, *as though we of ourselves*  
 “ *had fulfilled the law to the uttermost\**.” “ For  
 “ Christ’s righteousness God so accepteth us as  
 “ if it were our own†.” In the declaration signed  
 by Bradford, Coverdale, Hooper, and others, which  
 was drawn up and sent from their prison, they say,  
 “ We believe and confess concerning justification,  
 “ that it cometh only from God’s mercy through  
 “ Christ,” *viz.* “ forgiveness of sins, and Christ’s  
 “ righteousness *imputed* to us‡.” “ Justification  
 “ hath two parts: remission of sins, and *imputa-*  
 “ *tion* of Christ’s righteousness§.” Mr. Wilkins  
 has given us a quotation from Hooker, whom we  
 suppose therefore he admires. He cannot hold  
 him in higher estimation than we do, nor be more  
 disposed to bow to his authority. One of the  
 finest passages ever penned by man, shall be taken  
 from his works, to substantiate the point now  
 under consideration. “ Although in ourselves we  
 “ be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even  
 “ the man which is impious in himself, full of

\* Latimer’s Sermons, vol. i. p. 321.

† Nowell’s Cat. Fathers, vol. viii. p. 90.

‡ Fox, vol. iii. p. 83.

§ Perkins, vol. i. p. 82.

“ iniquity, full of sin, him being found in Christ  
 “ through faith, and having his sin remitted,  
 “ through repentance; him God upholdeth with  
 “ a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not  
 “ imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment  
 “ due thereunto by pardoning it, and accepteth  
 “ him in Jesus Christ, as perfectly righteous, as  
 “ if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him  
 “ in the law: shall I say more perfectly righteous  
 “ than if himself had fulfilled the whole law? I  
 “ must take heed what I say: but the Apostle  
 “ saith, ‘ *God made him to be sin for us, who knew*  
 “ ‘ *no sin; that we might be made the righteous-*  
 “ ‘ *ness of God in him.*’ *Such we are in the*  
 “ *sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of*  
 “ *God himself.* Let it be counted folly, or frenzy,  
 “ or fury, whatsoever; it is our comfort and our  
 “ wisdom; we care for no knowledge in the world  
 “ but this, that man hath sinned and God hath  
 “ suffered; that God hath made himself the Son  
 “ of man, and that men are made the righteous-  
 “ ness of God\*.”

The charge urged against us by our opponents  
 with so little regard to truth, and in the face of  
 historical testimony notoriously affirming the con-  
 trary, that we bring forward novel doctrines and  
 sentiments, shall be met also by one or two quota-  
 tions from the early Fathers. Basil assures us

\* Hooker's Works, fol. p. 495.

that Christ is the true righteousness: Theophylact confirms the declaration, by exhorting us to receive him as our righteousness by faith, and then we shall have all: Bernard, that excellent man and divine writer, glories in the thought that he can call himself righteous in the righteousness of another: Ἡ ἀληθὴς δικαιοσύνη ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἡμῶν σοφία ἀπὸ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός κ. τ. λ.\* Ἐι μέλλεις τὴν δικαιοσύνην σκεῖν, τὸν Χριστὸν λάβε διὰ πίστεως, καὶ ἔξεις τὸ πᾶν.† Again,—“ Nec vereor  
 “ sic erutus de potestate tenebrarum repelli a  
 “ Patre luminum, justificatus gratis in sanguine  
 “ Filii ejus. Nempe ipse qui justificat: quis est  
 “ qui condemnet? Non condemnavit justum, qui  
 “ misertus est peccatori. *Justum me dixerim, sed*  
 “ *illius justitia.* Quænam ipsa? *Finis legis*  
 “ *Christus, ad justitiam omni credenti.* Denique  
 “ *qui factus est nobis,* inquit, *justitia a Deo*  
 “ *Patre‡.*” The “ *ancient orthodoxy,*” then, is, that Christ’s righteousness constitutes the ground of a sinner’s justification before God. “ The  
 “ righteousness of Christ *wholly* imputed to him,  
 “ CAN, alone, purchase his salvation.” Mr. Wilkins denies, that this is the doctrine of the Church and of our Reformers. Let the reader judge for himself.

We proceed to another question. *What is the means by which man is justified?* An answer to

\* Basilii, tom. i. p. 464. † Theoph. in cap. x. ad Rom.

‡ Bernardi Opera, tom. i. p. 659.



it has been already given in the article:—by FAITH—FAITH ONLY. But it requires a fuller investigation. Does Mr. Wilkins wish to be informed what place this doctrine held in the “*ancient orthodoxy*?” We will gratify his wishes in some measure. He will allow that a companion and friend of one of the Apostles knew their mind, and was well acquainted with their doctrines. Such a man was Clemens Romanus. And he will tell him, that, in the matter of *justification*, “an act of special grace renders every consideration, but that of faith, vain.” He will further tell him, that *here* “his practical holiness is of no avail.” And, lastly, he will inform him, that this *orthodoxy* is so “ancient,” that there has been no other from the beginning. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, καὶ δι’ ἑαυτῶν δικαιοσμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι’ ἧς παντα τῆς ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν.\*

“And to this end tend all the Prophets, as St. Peter saith, in the tenth of the Acts (43); ‘Of ‘Christ all the Prophets,’ saith St. Peter, ‘do ‘witness, that, through his name, all they that ‘believe in him shall receive the remission of ‘sins.’

\* Clem. ad Cor. Ep. prior. p. 41, Ed. Oxon. 1633.  
—Comp. Milner’s Church Hist. vol. i. p. 130.

“ And after this wise to be *justified only by this*  
 “ *true and lively faith* in Christ, speak all the *old*  
 “ and *ancient*\* authors, both Greeks and Latins....  
 “ St. Hilary saith,—*Faith only justifieth.* And  
 “ St. Basil, a Greek author, writeth thus:—This  
 “ is a perfect and whole rejoicing in God, when a  
 “ man advanceth not himself for his own righ-  
 “ teousness; but acknowledgeth himself to lack  
 “ true justice and righteousness, and to be *justified*  
 “ *by the only faith* in Christ †.” The *definition*  
 given of faith in the same Homily, is worthy  
 of our attention:—“ The right and true Christian  
 “ faith, is, not only to believe that Holy Scripture,  
 “ and all the aforesaid articles of our faith, are  
 “ true; but also, to have *a sure trust and confi-*  
 “ *dence in God’s merciful promises,* to be saved  
 “ from everlasting damnation: whereof doth *follow*  
 “ a loving heart to obey his commandments ‡.”  
 Faith here is not a mere assent to a proposition;  
 nor credence given to an historical fact. Justifying  
 faith, although a mental act, calls forth all the  
 affections of the heart. While the understanding

\* We are in search of the “*ancient orthodoxy.*”

† Our Homily here quotes from the Twenty-Second Homily  
 of Basil de Humilitate. The learned reader may see how true  
 the translation is to the original:—Αὕτη ἡ τελεία καὶ ὁλόκληρος  
 καύχησις ἐν Θεῷ, ὅτι μήτε ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, τις ἐπαίρεται τῇ, ἑαυτῇ,  
 ἀλλ’ ἔγνω μὲν ἐνδεῇ ὄντι ἑαυτον δικαιοσύνης ἀληθῆς, πίσει δὲ μονῇ,  
 τῇ, εἰς Χριστὸν δεδικαιωμένον.

‡ Hom. of Salv.

is illuminated, while the judgment approves the method of salvation, as infinitely wise and infinitely glorious, the whole soul embraces Christ with an appropriating feeling of interest, satisfaction, and delight, in all the unsearchable perfections of his person, offices, and character. The language of faith is,—*This is MY God: I have waited for Him: I will be glad and rejoice in his salvation.* “Faith,” says Bishop Horsley, “is the *first principle* of that communion between the believer’s soul and the Divine Spirit, on which the whole of our spiritual life depends\*.” “Which faith is not an *opinion*, but a certain persuasion, *wrought by the Holy Ghost* in the *mind* and *heart* of man, where-through as the *mind* is *illuminated*, so the *heart* is *suppled* to submit itself to the will of God unfeignedly†.” Again; “‘*God sent his Son into the world,*’ saith St. John. To what end? ‘*That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have life everlasting.*’ (John iii. 16.) Mark these words, ‘*that whosoever believeth in him.*’ Here is the *mean* whereby we must apply the fruits of Christ’s death unto our deadly wound. Here is the *mean*, whereby we must obtain eternal life; namely, *faith*‡.” “By this then you may well perceive, that the only *mean* and *instrument*

\* Charges, p. 36.

† Declaration of the Martyrs, Fox, vol. iii. p. 83.

‡ Hom. on Pass.

“ of salvation required of our parts, is, *faith*\*.”  
 “ Faith *only* is able to perceive the mysteries of  
 “ God; *only* bringeth peace unto the heart; *only*  
 “ *taketh hold* on the righteousness that is in Christ  
 “ Jesus†.” “ Faith is like a hand wherewith we  
 “ receive the benefits of God; and except we take  
 “ his benefits with the hand of faith, we shall  
 “ never have them‡.” Nowell, Bishop Jewell,  
 Hooker, and a multitude of others, use the same  
 language. It is proved, then, beyond contradiction,  
 that our Reformers one and all maintained that  
*faith only justifies*. We therefore conclude this  
 part of our subject with an awakening declaration,  
 from one of the Homilies, which we have so  
 repeatedly referred to, leaving the application to  
 be made by those, who may consider themselves  
 involved in the cutting censure contained in it.  
 “ *This doctrine whosoever denieth, is not to be*  
 “ *accounted for a Christian man; nor for a*  
 “ *setter-forth of Christ's glory; but for an ad-*  
 “ *versary to Christ and his Gospel, and for a*  
 “ *setter-forth of men's vain glory*§.”

We are now led to another subject of examination; namely, *Who are the justified?* The Reformers uniformly maintained that none but the elect were justified. Can any doubt this? Let it then be asked, who is it that justifieth?

\* Hom. on Pass.

† King Ed. Cat. Fathers Eng. ch. ii. p. 363.

‡ Latimer.

§ Hom. of Salv.

“ *It is God that justifieth.*” What moves him to such an act of mercy? Any thing in the creature? What! an infinite Being, whose purposes coeval with his existence, and therefore fixed from eternity to eternity, wrought upon and influenced in his acts by a finite creature, and that creature the effect of his own volition? Of all absurdities this appears to us to be the greatest. But happily we are not left to mere reason. The word of God sets the matter at rest *in our minds*. It is not, however, our *ostensible* object to shew its agreement with Scripture: our ostensible object is, to prove that it was a doctrine not only held (that is too feeble a term), but proclaimed by the Reformers; and we leave them to vindicate the truth of it by an appeal to the oracles of God. Thus we reason concerning all the doctrines affirmed in these pages to be the doctrines of the Reformers. Such and such doctrines are laid down with precision and authority in their writings: but in those writings they uniformly appeal to Scripture to substantiate their truth, as we have seen in the extracts already produced: therefore they are shewn to be the doctrines of Scripture, and of the Reformation, at one and the same time, and that by the Reformers themselves. Proofs, then, without number, derived from the most unexceptionable sources, yea, whole treatises might be advanced in support of the doctrine in question: but we will content ourselves with a few quotations.

That we may not unnecessarily occupy too much space, we take the liberty of requesting our readers to refer to the Common Prayer Book, for the seventeenth Article, so expressly pointed out in the Royal Declaration, prefixed to the whole thirty-nine, as, “ THE *Article*,” which was designed to settle, at least among the Clergy, all controversy touching predestination and election. Pelagianism, semi-pelagianism, and arminianism (they differ but little from one another) are here all cut up by the roots.

Since, then, the Article sufficiently shews the doctrine of the Church, let us next examine the writings of the Reformers. We meet with the following passages in Bishop Ridley’s Commentary on the Ephesians, chap. i. “ God of his goodness “ *electeth*, and *chooseth whom he will, only* of his “ mere mercy and goodness, without all the de- “ servings of man: whom he hath *elected*, he “ *calleth* them for the most part by preaching of “ the Gospel, and by the hearing of the word of “ God, to faith in Christ Jesus: and through faith “ he *justifieth* them\*.” “ What thing could we “ deserve, *before we were born*, that provoked “ God to love us, or was the cause why that God “ loved us? Nothing.” Again, in King Edward’s Catechism, we read, “ as many as are in this faith “ stedfast, were *forechosen, predestinated*, and

\* Fathers of the Eng. Ch. vol. ii. p. 30, 31.

“ *appointed out* to everlasting life, before the  
 “ world was made.” Bradford attests the same  
 thing:—“ God hath of his own mercy and good  
 “ will, and to the praise of his grace and glory in  
 “ Christ, elected some and not all, whom he hath  
 “ predestinated unto everlasting life in the same  
 “ Christ; and in *his time calleth* them, *justifieth*  
 “ them, and *glorifieth* them, so that they shall  
 “ never perish, and err to damnation finally\*.”  
 Again; “ God’s foresight is not the cause of sin, or  
 “ excuseable necessity to him that sinneth; the  
 “ damned, therefore, have not, nor shall have any  
 “ excuse, because God foreseeing their condem-  
 “ nation, or through their own sin, did not draw  
 “ them, as he doth his elect, unto Christ. But as  
 “ the elect have cause to thank God for ever for  
 “ his great mercies in Christ, so the other have  
 “ cause to lament their own wilfulness, sin, and  
 “ contemning of Christ, which is the *cause* of their  
 “ reprobation, and wherein we should look upon  
 “ reprobation; as the goodness of God in Christ  
 “ is the cause of our election and salvation, wherein  
 “ we should look upon God’s election†.” Again;  
 “ St. Austin saith, some man will affirm that God  
 “ did choose us, *because he saw before that we*  
 “ *should do good works*: but Christ saith not so,  
 “ which saith, ‘ Ye have not chosen me, but I  
 “ ‘ have chosen you;’ for (saith he) if he had

\* Vol. vi. p. 374.

† P. 392.

“ chosen us because he saw before that we  
 “ should do good works, then should he also  
 “ have seen before that we should *first have*  
 “ *chosen him*, which is contrary to the words of  
 “ Christ, and mind of the Evangelist\*.” “ Cer-  
 “ tain it is,” says Archbishop Cranmer, “ that  
 “ our election cometh *only* and *wholly* of the  
 “ benefit and grace of God†;” and “ the elect, in  
 “ whom finally no fault shall be, shall perpetually  
 “ continue and endure‡.” The reader may see  
 other testimonies from the more ancient Fathers,  
 in Mr. Milner’s Church History. Bernard and  
 Anselm§, even in the eleventh and twelfth cen-  
 turies, state this doctrine in no unambiguous terms.  
 “ Therefore to affirm, teach, and *preach* it, hath  
 “ in it no hurt, no vice, no evil: much less then  
 “ hath it any enormity (as *some* do affirm) to the  
 “ eyes and spirit of them, which are *guided*, and  
 “ will be, *by the word of God*||.” It has been  
 said, that the seventeenth Article is silent upon  
 reprobation. The assertion does not appear to us  
 clearly proved; for, what is the meaning of the  
 expression, “ the *sentence* of God’s predestina-  
 tion?” It is, however, admitted that no formal  
 proposition is enunciated respecting this awful  
 subject. We admire the moderation of the framers

\* Frith, vol. i. p. 369.

† Vol. iii. p. 91.

‡ P. 87.

§ Vol. iii. p. 322. 408.

|| Bradford, vol. vi. p. 374.



of the Article, and would wish to imitate it. The reader, we trust, will pardon us if, in closing our extracts from the Reformers, in illustration of this doctrine, we, for once, avail ourselves of a quotation from a writer of the present day. But the sentiment is so well expressed, and is so perfectly accordant with our views, that we cannot refrain from producing it. We have moreover the happiness of knowing that the writer, even in Mr. Wilkins' estimation, is altogether unexceptionable. He observes, " that godly persons are partakers of  
 " the ordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, ani-  
 " mating them to an earnest and a zealous  
 " discharge of all religious obligations, and im-  
 " parting to them the strong hope of their *election*  
 " in Christ Jesus \*."

We now hasten to the last point we proposed to illustrate, relating to justification, and that was—*how the justified are to be known and distinguished.* The answer is easy;—by the general tenor of their life and conversation. Here, as before, let the Reformers speak for themselves. One quotation will suffice, because it expresses so much in a small space. " Though we say, there is no trust to be  
 " put in the merits of our works and actions, and  
 " place all the hopes and reason of our salvation  
 " only in Christ; yet we do not therefore say,

\* Mr. Wilkins' Letter, p. 12.

“ that men should live loosely and dissolutely, as  
 “ if baptism and faith were sufficient for a Chris-  
 “ tian, and there were nothing more required.  
 “ *The true faith is a living faith, and cannot be*  
 “ *idle*; therefore we teach the people, that God  
 “ hath not called us to luxury and disorder, but,  
 “ as St. Paul saith, unto good works, *that we*  
 “ *might walk in them* (Eph. ii. 10). *That God*  
 “ *hath delivered us from the power of darkness,*  
 “ *that we might serve the living God* (Col. i. 10).  
 “ That we should root up all the relics of sin;  
 “ *that we should work out our salvation with fear*  
 “ *and trembling* (Phil. ii. 12); that it might  
 “ appear that the spirit of sanctification, and that  
 “ Christ himself dwelleth in our hearts by faith\*.”

We have now finished our inquiry respecting  
 the doctrines of the Church, and the sentiments of  
 our Reformers, upon the points before mentioned.  
 One point we have omitted, because the reader  
 may consult the late publications upon it—we  
 mean the subject of baptism, to which we beg to  
 refer him. Either Mr. Scott’s work, or Mr. Bid-  
 dulph’s, will afford ample elucidation, and most  
 satisfactory replies to the absurd statements of Dr.  
 Mant.

“ We think we have abundantly proved, that  
 “ ‘ all is not gold that glitters,’ nor are those all

\* Jewell’s Apology, Fathers, vol. vii. p. 32.

“ members of the Church of England who assume  
 “ that name\*.” It is at least pretty obvious that  
*some* of the vessels of the sanctuary are lacquered  
 over with a very thin, though a very gaudy  
 material.

Is it not Mr. Wilkins, who is the advocate of a  
*modern* faith? Is *he* not the seceder from “ the  
 “ ancient and sober principles of the venerable Esta-  
 “ blishment?” Out of his own mouth he is con-  
 demned: for he himself tells us, that “ the wilful  
 “ deviation by individuals from such forms as had  
 “ been established when the Church was first  
 “ founded, was considered by St. Paul to be  
 “ schism.” Let him examine his own system, if  
 system it can be called; and let him investigate  
 more diligently, and weigh more carefully, the  
 doctrines of the Church, before he thus presumes  
 to assail them. Let him not arrogate to himself  
 the privilege of throwing out unfounded calumnies  
 against his brethren, without anticipating exposure,  
 which will cover him with disgrace. We say  
 again, let him investigate the truth. It will bear  
 investigation. Like the works of nature, the more  
 narrowly it is inspected, the more will its beauties  
 be displayed. Lyttleton and West are glorious  
 examples of its power. Happy should we be, if  
 the result of such an investigation, on his part,

\* Second Letter, p. 32. “ Theodoret tells us, that though  
 “ Nestorius was an heretic, yet he covered himself, τῆς  
 “ ὀρθοδοξίας προσχηματί, with the pretence and cloak of the  
 “ orthodox faith.”—*Jewell's Apology*.

were to harmonise with their productions from the press. We shall be rejoiced to learn, that he has been led, and is endeavouring to lead others, into those blessed doctrines, which can alone regenerate, and sanctify, and save the children of men.

We have already intimated, that it is no part of our plan to prove our Articles Calvinistic: we contend not about *words*, but for *things*. If we had chosen, we might, however, have disproved the assertion, that Horsley “ declares the doctrines “ of our Church to be compounded of equal parts “ of Calvinism and Arminianism.” We might confront it with a very different account of the matter in the learned Prelate’s own words:—“ Per- haps,” he says, “ in points of mere doctrine the “ language of our Articles agrees more nearly with “ the Calvinistic, than with any other Protestant “ confession, except the Lutheran\*.” But we waive this. While we can ascertain what doctrines our Reformers embraced, we care not, nor contend about their “ *leaning* to Calvinism.” We know what they leaned upon, and that is enough for us. They, like the Church in the wilderness†, *leaned upon their beloved*; their Redeemer, *able to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him*‡. We have seen in what way they availed themselves of his wisdom, power, and grace.

Those deep and mysterious points of doctrine, of which Mr. Wilkins has spoken in terms of profaneness ill befitting “ God’s ambassador;”—terms

\* Letters to Priestley, p. 398. † Cant. viii. 5. ‡ Heb. vii. 25.

that we will not allow ourselves to repeat, are to be found either openly maintained, or incidentally referred to, in the writings of men, who for upwards of a thousand years before Calvin was born, had adorned and edified the Christian Church. Among the primitive Fathers, such as Augustine, Hilary, Prosper, and Fulgentius, they are recognised; and were also asserted, at a later period, by Huss, Jerome of Prague, Grosseteste, Wickliffe, and Bradwardine. It is, in short, notorious that Augustine restored these doctrines to the Church after they had been long buried, or obscured during the corruptions and perturbations that succeeded the apostolic age. We might learn, even from Bishop Burnet's *Exposition*\*, that that remarkable man, with the exception of his views upon baptism, avowed all the doctrines contained in what is generally known by the name of Calvinism. And yet, in defiance of the testimony of ecclesiastical history, and the writings of the Fathers, Mr. Wilkins affirms, that Calvin was "the *projector* of this scheme."

Of Calvin himself Mr. Wilkins has spoken in terms of sickening flippancy;—the man, whose profound erudition, whose brilliant talents, whose indefatigable application, and whose ardent piety, have successively drawn forth the eulogium of a Scaliger, a Hooker, and a Horsley. Although we by no means wish to defend his conduct in the affair of Servetus, we could easily shew, if our

\* Art. xvii.

limits allowed it, that the accusation, as it is brought forward and expressed in the Second Letter, is as unfounded as it is contemptible.

Reference is made to Dr. Maltby's Sermons and Notes, and the reader is desired to see them. We have not thought it worth our while to comply with the recommendation, not being by any means disposed to pay deference to one, who, in the year 1812, informed the public, that the Bible was never *intended*, nor *calculated* for general circulation. But we have consulted Calvin's Institutes, which we intend to quote for the purpose of preferring a very serious charge against the Author of these Letters. We much regret that we have to charge him with either *gross* and *culpable ignorance*, or *wilful misrepresentation* \*. But justice must be done. He professes to give Calvin's own words. We beg the reader to observe particularly, that a clause pretending to be from the third book of the Institutes of Calvin, is given in the form of a quotation, and is, as all quotations ought to be,

\* We find in a note to p. 11, of the "Second Letter," an advertisement, which appeared on the Cover of the Christian Guardian for August last; and the Editor of that respectable publication is, in consequence, held up to ridicule, as if he were responsible for its contents. It would be just as reasonable to indict the Editor of the Nottingham Journal for a libel, because Mr. Wilkins' Letters happened to be advertised in that paper. Neither is the EVANGELICAL Magazine responsible for the sentiments of a work, called "Body and Soul," because it was advertised in that publication last July.

included within inverted commas. It is given moreover as invested with all the gravity of a set proposition, and as the *dictum* of Calvin exhibiting his deliberate judgment. The book, the chapter, and the section are named. It is affirmed that Calvin “ *has decided* (Inst. iii. 24. 12) *that, even among those to whom the Gospel is preached, the number of reprobates is to that of the elect nearly in the proportion of four to one.*” The only passage in the section that we can find at all likely to be so tortured, is the following: “ Apud centum eadem fere habetur concio, viginti prompta fidei obedientia suscipiunt: alii vel nullius pensi habent, vel rident, vel explodunt, vel abominantur. Siquis respondeat, diversitatem ex eorum provenire malitia et perversitate, nondum satisfactum fuerit: quia et illorum ingenium eadem malitia occuparetur, nisi Deus suae bonitatis corrigeret. Ideoque semper implicabimur, nisi succurrat illud Pauli, *Quis te discernit?* (1 Cor. iv. 7.) Quo significat non propria virtute, sed sola Dei gratia alios aliis præcellere.” For the benefit of the unlearned reader we will translate it. “ The same discourse shall be addressed to a hundred persons; of these, twenty receive it with the ready obedience of faith: the rest, some have no thought concerning it, some deride it, some disapprove of it, others detest it. Should it be said that this diversity proceeds from the wickedness and obstinacy of the latter, we are still without a satisfactory explanation:

“ because, the former would have been held in the  
 “ same captivity to sin, if God, of his goodness,  
 “ had not set them free. We shall therefore be  
 “ perpetually involved in difficulty, unless we run  
 “ for relief to the interrogatory of the Apostle,  
 “ *Who hath made thee to differ?* (1 Cor. iv. 7.)  
 “ By which he means to shew, that some are ren-  
 “ dered more excellent than others, not for any  
 “ goodness in themselves, but solely from God’s  
 “ free grace.”

Now we should be glad to know, in what respect this differs, as to its spirit and meaning, from the parable of the sower. In that parable, only one description of persons out of four received the word of God. Some seeds fell by the way side—some fell upon stony ground—some fell among thorns—others fell into good ground\*. In like manner, Calvin puts a case:—Out of one hundred, twenty receive the word when they hear it,—of the rest, some are careless—some deride—some abuse—others detest it. Could it be imagined, that either ignorance or malice could so pervert his words, as to impute to Calvin the having decided upon the definite number that are to be saved? We assert, without fear of contradiction, that no such decision is to be found in any part of his works. The truth is, that both the parable and Calvin’s statement may be considered as nothing more than a comment upon our Lord’s declaration—*many are called, but few chosen*.

\* Matt. xiii.



During the progress of this inquiry we have had to look into the accounts that are left upon record of the lives and deaths of those blessed men, who sealed their testimony to the truth with their blood. These were indeed “our great Reformers.” We have given but a scanty and superficial exhibition of their doctrines and sentiments. Whether these are the truths that are unfolded in their “*full* meaning” to the people in the Churches of this town, we presume not to decide. But thus much we will affirm, that if these are the doctrines of the Church, then in so far as her Ministers, be they who they may, fall short of this standard of orthodoxy; if they either openly impugn, or *judiciously* enervate the “thoughts that breathe,” and the “words that burn” upon the pages of our yet living, yet speaking martyrs, their boasted claim to Churchmanship is but the hollow profession of attachment to a body without a soul, a shadow without the substance, an altar without a flame. O let them ponder the monuments of their forefathers’ greatness—the men who were so rich in indigence, and so free in chains. Let them traverse over the historic region, marked as it is, on the one hand, by cruelty and bigotry, and oppression and murder; and, on the other, by the most meek endurance, by faith, by the deepest humility, by the most unbounded joy, by the zeal that the damp dungeon could not assuage, and by fortitude that the fire was unable to consume:—a region exhibiting in short the most wonderful and

overwhelming display of mortality sublimated and sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God.

“ Now if we have made it appear, and that not  
 “ obscurely and craftily, but truly and ingenuously,  
 “ clearly and perspicuously, that we teach the most  
 “ holy Gospel of God, and that the ancient Fathers,  
 “ and the whole primitive Church, are on our side,...  
 “ and if they, who so much detest our doctrine, and  
 “ pride themselves in the name of” *orthodox*, “ shall  
 “ apparently see that all those pretences of antiquity,  
 “ of which they so immoderately glory, belong not to  
 “ them, and that there is more strength in our cause  
 “ than they thought there was ; then we hope, that  
 “ none of them will be so careless of his salvation,  
 “ but he will at some time or other bethink himself  
 “ which side he ought to join with\*.”

To the *truly orthodox* members of our loved and venerated Church, we would address a parting word by way of encouragement ; and, in bidding them farewell, would say to them—“ *Go to therefore, dear hearts in the Lord ; waver not in Christ’s religion, truly taught you and set forth in King Edward’s days †.*”

\* Jewell’s Apology, Fathers, vol. vii. p. 12.

† Bradford, vol. vi. p. 47.

FINIS.



AA 000 702 577 8

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
THIS BOOK CARD



University Research Library

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57

DATE 42145-0



CALL NUMBER

VOL PT COP

AUTHOR

